



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

themselves have made so many thousand corrections in theirs within 50 years past. And we think it very unreasonable that any Roman Catholic should say, as the poor monk in Mayo, and Mr. Lucas, the editor of the *Tablet*, have said, that the Protestant Bible is "the Devil's Book," when, in fact, it is the Book by which their own translation has been corrected. We ask Roman Catholics to remember that the Roman Catholic Bibles now circulated, with the approbation of all the Roman Catholic bishops, have been corrected by the Protestant Bible. Surely, then, they cannot think that the Protestant Bible is "the Devil's Book."

We showed in our last paper, that only for the Protestant Bible, Roman Catholics would never have had the Douay Bible at all. We have now showed them that the Douay Bible has been corrected in a vast number of places, and many of them very important places, by the Protestant Bible. This may well lead them to give a candid consideration to the things in which the two translations still differ. We shall return to this part of the subject again.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

BY HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL WISEMAN.

IT was with feelings and expectations of a mixed kind that we began the perusal of this tract. We are glad, at any time, to meet with an argument written by a modern Roman Catholic divine, addressed to the members of his own communion; for, in quoting his words, or in stating their substance, with references to his text, we are safe from the suspicion of intentional mis-statement. When we took up a paper, not only re-published, but given to the world under the high sounding name of Cardinal Wiseman, we looked for that which, indeed, we found—ability, eloquence, a certain plausibility of reasoning and still more of manner. But we also expected an appearance of candour, and a line of argument more weighty, more difficult to meet in reply, than we think this tract presents: we did not anticipate that the manly intellect and well-known talent and learning of Cardinal Wiseman could stoop to such weapons as shallow misrepresentation; or rely upon those hacknied sophistries which we so often find palmed in place of argument upon Roman Catholics to justify the restricted use of the Holy Scriptures. Whether these remarks are just we shall presently leave to the candour of our readers.

This paper first appeared in the *The Dublin Review*, under the title of "The Bible in Maynooth." It purports to be a review of an introductory work on Scripture, by the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon, then professor of the Holy Scriptures at the College of Maynooth. In its present form, however, a very small portion of it is devoted to the notice of that work; and of that portion, none but the few opening sentences call for any observation from us. The tract opens in a tone of triumphant exultation at the "consternation" which Dr. Dixon's work will cause in the "enemy's camp;" not by its arguments, its learning, &c., all of which are duly praised, but by the discovery it will impart of the actual existence of a chair of Holy Scripture at Maynooth—a professorship not existing (*eo nomine*) in the universities of "the enemy." Cardinal Wiseman is mistaken if he supposes that the "enemy" will, on this discovery, jump to the simple conclusion that because Maynooth pays a professor, it must follow that, in a *bona fide* sense, "Scripture is there read, Scripture is studied, Scripture is expounded." The tree planted at Maynooth, like every tree in the garden of Christianity, must be submitted to the test appointed by our Lord himself, and be known by its fruits. Now, we are not disposed to inquire how far the alumnus of Maynooth comes up to the character which St. Paul describes as befitting a servant of God, who, he says, "must not wrangle, but be mild towards all men, apt to teach, patient, with modesty admonishing them that resist the truth."—2 Tim. ii. 24. Such an inquiry would afford no certain test of the nature and quality of the Scripture instruction at Maynooth: for, unhappily, there is too little mildness elsewhere also. We doubt not, too, that there are some excellent and pious priests who do read the Bible for themselves, though they may not feel at liberty to urge its study on the laity, but we are obliged, by the experience of others as well as our own, to say we seldom meet in Ireland a priest of Maynooth who even pretends to an intimate acquaintance of the Holy Scripture—to that head knowledge of it which is the peculiar fruit of the professor's labours. You may meet and converse with the Maynooth-educated priest in every steam boat, railway carriage, public place; you may see the rapid movement of his lips when engaged in the recital of his devotional exercises; you may observe in his hand the open Missal or the Breviary; but you seldom see with him a copy of the Douay or any other Bible; you can seldom trace, by his conversation or otherwise that he is a well-instructed or a habitual reader of Scripture. Until we see the fruits therefore, we are unable to believe that the tree of Scripture instruction, though it may be planted at Maynooth, has been properly nurtured and trained, so as to take deep root and flourish in the soil.

Cardinal Wiseman rejoices, that Dr. Dixon has taken possession of a ground, which, he says belongs of right exclusively to the "Catholic." Every Protestant, says he, who, if he reads the Bible at all, does not understand three words of what he reads, who does not practice one of its precepts, considers himself entitled to ask any Catholic, "why do

you not do as I do, make the Bible your rule of faith, and use the privilege of reading it and judging for yourself?" The Catholic, so interrogated, "knows that it is a foregone conclusion that all religion consists in reading, or pretending to read the Bible; that he who does not at least claim the privilege of reading it as he likes, though he may never use it, is something horrible, while he who boasts of it, and talks about it, secures some sort of religious pre-eminence here, and has a passport for the sort of fools paradise, which he considers Heaven to be."

The "Catholic," therefore, for want of courage, instead of saying, "and pray sir," (or "madam") what do you know about the Bible, or where did you get the book you call by that name, or how do you know that it is the Bible at all?" will assert that his Church *does* permit him and some others to read the Bible, thus admitting the principle of his adversary, instead of taking the "higher ground" of denying the right of Protestants to use, much more their right to interpret the Bible, to which, he says, they have no claim, and asserts that they "can prove neither its canon, its inspiration, nor its primary doctrines, except through that very authority which they are questioning."

Cardinal Wiseman writes exclusively for the "Catholic" reader, and draws freely enough upon his credulity and ignorance of Scripture, and consequently of true Protestantism. When he speaks of it as "decided by the newspapers and by Exeter Hall," that all religion consists in reading or pretending to read the Bible, or that the dry and barren reading of it, even without the "boasting and talking" he speaks of, gives any pre-eminence, or any privilege but that of better means of knowledge with the attendant increased responsibility, he greatly mistakes, or, at all events, mis-states the principles of Protestantism. He may be challenged to produce any evidence of the truth of his account of the Protestant notion of Scripture reading. No Protestant would insult the understanding of an assembly at Exeter Hall, or anywhere else, by asserting that the bare reading of the Bible gives one sinner a superiority over his fellow sinner. Protestants profess to take the Scripture as their guide, and it is not the hearing or the reading, but the doing of the word, the conformity of men's lives to its precepts, that they find inculcated in Scripture, and that they therefore profess to consider as the profitable fruit of its study.

Another misrepresentation of a different kind is the statement that Protestants cannot prove the canon, inspiration, &c., of the Bible, "save through the very authority they are questioning." The argument of Cardinal Wiseman would be lame, indeed, if he once admitted what Protestants insist upon, the internal evidence of inspiration afforded by the Scriptures. And as to the canon, it is a mistake to suppose that Protestants do not attach weight to the authority and practice of the Christian Church from the Apostolic age downwards. Not only was the canon of Scripture, as recognised by the early Church, adopted by Protestants of the Church of England in her Articles, but they made use of this evidence in support of the practice of infant baptism, the observance of the Sabbath, and other matters. What they deny is the infallibility of any Church; and they totally deny what Dr. Wiseman, of course, asserts, that the primitive Christian Church and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same. The infallible authority of the latter they reject; the legitimate power of the former they admit.

The Cardinal proceeds to compare the alleged cry of "the Bible! the Bible! nothing but the Bible;" with the Jews senseless cry of the "Temple of the Lord," and describes the one to be as "perilous to salvation," as "vain, formal, and superstitious" as the other. As the temple became an idol and was destroyed, so he prophesies will the Bible be also removed—nay, the process he says, is actually going on; for, on the one hand the learned Protestantism of the continent is hastening into the abyss of infidelity, and dragging the Bible with it down to the level of an ordinary book, an uninspired old record; on the other hand the handling of it by the unlearned is destroying its vitality. The description of this process affords probably the best specimen of the Cardinal's style, and in our usual spirit of fair dealing, we transcribe his very words:—

"The holy, the sublime, the awful word of God, over which saints have meditated in cells for years of ineffable sweetness, yet of solemn reverence, round which scholars, pale with watching, have wreathed the flowers they have woven, or culled, in variegated commentaries; which the silver voice of virgins, or the deep tones of monks, have chaunted in breathless midnight, that no earthly sound might disturb the depth of their meditation; this compilation of the one spirit of God from the providence of centuries, through which alone He has lived; this treasure of spiritual honey, drawn from a thousand flowers of various delicacy of perfume and flavour, not mixing, but each preserved; this gem of matchless price, reflecting in an infinite number of faces, the ever varying, yet constant image of God, in his might, in his sweetness, in his anger, in his love, in his unity, in his Trinity, in his heavens, on his earth, on Sinai and on Calvary; this noblest, greatest, divinest of things unsacramental, is put, indiscriminately, unceremoniously, into the hands of every one. It is the school-boy's task book, it is the jailor's present, it is the drunkard's pawned pledge, it is the dotard's text book, it is the irreverent jester's butt, it is the fanatic's justification for every vice, blasphemy, and profaneness which he commits. For into every one's hand it must needs be thrust, from the Chinese to the Ojibbawa, from the Laplander to

the Bosjesman; from the child to the dotard, from the stuttering peasant to the glib self righteous old dame."

The argument proceeds to the effect, that there is no evidence but the word of the giver, that this book, so put into every hand, clean or unclean, is what it is called—the Word of God. There is no previous study, no demonstration of genuineness or information about the writers, &c. Full power is given to uninstructed minds to interpret it as they please, and to put any construction they please upon it, and it is asked what code of laws, moral or social, could, with safety, be thus treated? The Bible, it is alleged, is the most abstruse book extant, and allusion is made in proof of this to the genealogies of Genesis and Esdras, the architectural details of Exodus, Kings, and Ezekiel, the minutiae of the Levitical code, &c. To the objection supposed to be made to this argument—namely, that the "Bible-alone theory" does not exclude guidance in the use of Scripture, and that commentaries and expositions have been written by Protestants, and that reformed clergymen expound the Scriptures to their flocks—it is answered to the effect, first, that there is not one copy of any commentary sold for a hundred copies of the Bible given away—and, secondly, the great variety of opinions to which the indiscriminate use of the Scripture gives rise is relied upon. Every man goes to his own Church and preacher, and learns a different doctrine from that professed by others; so that the Scriptures, so given and thus variously interpreted, are "wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction." The dominions of Queen Pomare are pointed to in triumph, where it is alleged that, "under the judicious management of evangelical missionaries, a mild and promising people were transformed into a pack of lazy, immoral infidels." The slowness of the destructive effect in England of the Word of God is attributed to a "strong underground of old tradition" which the Reformation could not dig up, the "civilization interwoven with old truths," "a deference to rank and wealth," and attention is invited to the agencies at work to destroy "these preservative and conservative influences. The poisonings, infanticides, disregard of conjugal ties, and increase of illegitimacy in the rural districts in England, and the infidel publications in towns, are pressed into service for this purpose, and, it is asserted, that the Bible is "unable to contend" with these evils. Modern science, electricity, and even mesmerism, are brought in aid, as furnishing new implements for the attempt to uproot the inspiration of Scripture miracles and prophecy. The two ways, therefore, in which the unlimited use of Scripture is leading to the destruction of this "ill-used blessing," and to the "spread of infidelity less intellectual and more sensual than German rationalism" consist—first, in the want of evidence that accompanies the Scriptures beyond the word of man; and secondly, in the innumerable varieties of opinion into which unlearned men, judging for themselves, must fall. An argument of Dr. Dixon is then touched upon, founded upon the following extract from a charge of the Bishop of London—"To deny the inspiration of Scripture is one step towards the rejection of the Gospel as a revelation from God. Against this fatal heresy I would earnestly caution my younger brethren." &c. And the following is quoted as Dr. Dixon's "pithy comment":—"We are here told, and truly, that to deny inspiration is to embrace a fatal heresy. On the other hand, the Church of England, in her 6th Article, declares that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' We shall see, just now, how, by adhering to the doctrine of this article, any one can be convicted of fatal heresy, for denying the inspiration of Scripture." Dr. Wiseman proceeds to assure us that Dr. Dixon has established this point satisfactorily. He prefers, however, giving us his own logic on the subject, as follows:—

"A fatal heresy can only be the denial of an article of faith necessary to salvation. But, according to the Articles nothing can be of faith which cannot be proved by Scripture; it follows, therefore, that the inspiration of Scripture is proved by Scripture: hence, we have this process of logical demonstration established. You are bound, under pain of heresy to believe in the inspiration of the Bible. But as no heresy can exist unless the doctrine which it contradicts be read in the Bible, it follows that you are obliged to believe in the inspiration of the Bible, because that inspiration is there declared. But belief in what is there taught, as an essential truth, to deny which is heresy, pre-supposes the recognition of the Bible as an inspired book; and, therefore, you are thrown back and inspired, from one horn to the other; you believe in the Bible because it is inspired, and you believe it is inspired because you find it in the Bible."

The whole argument concludes with the following proposition:—

"The truth is comprised in a few words—'No infallible Church, no Bible.' On no less, on no other authority could such a tremendous fact be received; no weaker foundation will uphold it."

We have endeavoured to give a connected sketch of the substance of this argument; and, in order to do so, have resisted the frequent temptation to interrupt the thread of it with observations of our own. The first thing that strikes the mind of the Bible-reader on perusal of it is, the total rejection of the internal evidence (to which we have before

adverted) as affording proof of the Divine origin of Scripture. It is a question too long for discussion here; and we must pass it by with the remark that Dr. Wiseman himself, if he has read, as no doubt he has, the works of Paley,* cannot but admire the lucid and satisfactory manner in which the truth of the historical parts of the New Testament is proved by the mere collation and comparison of different passages, independent of external evidence. Such proof of the historical parts opens the door at once to all that noble train of reasoning founded upon them, written by the same author, in his work on the Evidences of Christianity. The truth of the Gospels follows, of course; and, in short, when once we can find a spot of Divine revelation large enough for the foot to rest upon, proved satisfactorily, without external aid, the proof of the whole must be easily established. But the next thing that strikes us is the total rejection of Divine aid in the understanding and interpretation of Scripture. Cardinal Wiseman may be himself a great Biblical scholar, as, no doubt, he is; but if his pamphlet were written by an Infidel, it could not more completely set at naught the teaching and guidance of the Holy Spirit, which is promised to all that ask it in sincerity. It is not to prelates or priests, but to every one that asketh, it shall be given; every one that seeketh findeth, and to every one that knocketh it shall be opened.

This belief, professed by Protestants, founded on the express promises of God, that all who ask it shall receive the Spirit to guide them to all truth, by which they, of course, understand all vital and essential truth—all truth necessary to salvation—is not even honoured with a sneer. And yet upon this promise of the teaching of the spirit rests the true answer to that part of Cardinal Wiseman's argument, which is founded upon the variety of opinion to which the free use of Scripture leads. He argues from the abuse against the use; we say, that the humble student of Scripture, who prays earnestly for Divine assistance cannot, if the promises of God are true, fall into error in anything essential to salvation. If a variety of opinions be formed by the Infidel, the Rationalist, those who set their own reason above, instead of using it with the aid of Heavenly revelation, the true use of the Bible is not, on this account, to be denied to the Christian. We must observe that Dr. Wiseman perverts what he calls the "Bible-alone axiom" of Protestants; and he also is guilty of gross misrepresentation when he asserts, or insinuates, that Protestants hold that every man is at liberty to interpret Scripture according to his will and fancy, without any other guidance than his own reason. The "Bible alone" axiom is solely applied to the question of the rule of faith of Protestants; Cardinal Wiseman treats it as if the Bible alone, and not the keeping of its precepts, constituted their religion. Again, the Church of England, and almost every Protestant sect, professes to have its oral teaching by its ministers, both in and out of the pulpit. What it maintains is not the right of capricious interpretation, but the right of exercising the reason, with humility and prayer, and thus of judging whether the doctrine taught by its clergy is in accordance with the Word of God. That the Scriptures are, as it must be confessed, with regret, they are, often turned to a bad use, perhaps made the "jester's butt" or the "drunkard's pledge," is no more a just argument against the free use of them than a similar profane use, by the same class of persons, of those relics, and rosaries, and crucifixes, which the Church of Rome holds sacred, would be against delivering these venerated things to the good "Catholic;" and yet that Church never scruples, and we suppose Cardinal Wiseman himself would not scruple, to place them in the hands of every one that professes a willingness to receive them, even the untutored African or American savage. The difficulties of some parts of Scripture present an argument equally devoid of force against the general reading of it. Scripture, we are told, is "profitable to teach, to correct, to instruct in justice"—2 Timothy iii. 16—notwithstanding the abstruseness of parts of it which do not relate to matters essential to Christian doctrine. St. Peter, when he speaks of the "things hard to be understood"—2 Peter iii. 16, 17—cautions the brethren, not to abstain from the reading of the Scriptures, but to "take heed lest, being led aside by the error of the unwise, they should fall from their own steadfastness." We cannot but regret the eagerness which is apparent in that part of Cardinal Wiseman's argument—where he brings forward every piece of hypocrisy, immorality, infidelity, and vice he can find, as if he gloated over it with triumph, and lays it all at the door of the sacred Word of God. Now we deny in toto that these things are attributable to any such cause. The infidelity on the continent, by no means confined to Protestants, we could easily trace to far different sources. If vice in some parts of England be on the increase, it will be found owing more to the neglect than the use of Scripture and of religious teaching; owing also to other causes in conjunction with that neglect, yet totally unconnected with religion. While we refuse to admit the unproved assertions of Cardinal Wiseman respecting the subjects of Queen Pomare to be true, we reply to them on the one hand by saying, that we are not without materials, if we had but space, to show the blessed effects of the preaching of the Gospel upon many individuals in the island of Tahiti; effects most satisfactory to those who know both by experience and from the express words of our Lord, how small a proportion the "chosen" must bear to the "called,"

wherever the Gospel is preached; and, on the other hand, by pointing, by way of set off, to those other parts of the world to which the cardinal would have referred if he found anything there to aid his argument. The wonderful changes wrought by missionary labour and Gospel teaching amongst the red men of America, the sons of Ham in Africa, and the cannibals of New Zealand, may be adduced as examples on the other side. We may also refer to the United States, where there is but little of that "underground of old tradition," where the civilization is not much "interwoven with old truths," where there is not to be found that "deference to rank and wealth, their opinions and doctrines," which Cardinal Wiseman would represent as checking the evil effects of God's word at home. There, at least, all religious creeds meet on equal terms. There the word can "run" and "have free course," and yet we do not find that immorality and infidelity prevail, though doubtless that free soil is unfavourable to the Church of Rome, as has been abundantly proved by Roman Catholic authorities within the last few years.* But if we descend to lower ground, and point to the temporal fruits of the spread of Christian truth; if, without excluding other causes of social progress, we give, as truth obliges us to do, to the influence of the Gospel by far the foremost place amongst the causes of the advancement of civilization in the greater part of the world—an influence pervading the whole of society, and operating indirectly upon those supposed to be furthest removed from its direct control; if we point to the almost unlimited freedom tempered with order, the willing obedience to law, respect for Sabbaths, regard for religious observances, universal toleration, humane laws, munificent contributions, splendid charities, and the general energy and spirit, all combining to place the English nation in a position unparalleled by anything to be seen on the face of the earth, or to be read of in the page of history; if we pursue this investigation and see the extension of all or most of these blessings from England their parent over all her scattered dependencies, as well as throughout the American Continent; we may well smile at the beggarly regiment of infidels, scoffers, and profligates, which Cardinal Wiseman is able to muster from the "slums of Westminster," and with which he vainly expects to exclude the Bible and, with the Bible, we contend, the progress of eternal truth from the people.

When we come, however, to the conclusion of all this argument—"No infallible Church, no Bible," we cannot but feel amazed at the coolness with which a Roman Catholic divine calculates the exact length to which he will permit his flock to use their reason and intellect. His whole train of argument, including that upon the Bishop of London's charge (which we pass by for the present, as founded on the exclusion of internal evidence of the inspiration of Scripture) is addressed, to the credulity of his readers, indeed, as to facts, but to their reasoning faculties as to argument. Does he flatter himself that any rational person can bring his mind to a stand still, at "no infallible Church, no Bible," and not ask the next question that forces itself upon his reason, and say—"If the Bible rests upon the infallible Church, what does the infallible Church rest upon? How do you prove your infallibility? If you say, I rest it upon the Divine commission given to Saint Peter and his successors, when our Lord said—'Upon this rock will I build my Church,' or upon the promise of our Lord to be with his Church 'all days, unto the end of the world,' I answer, are not these sayings and promises to be found only in the Bible? If you attempt to prove your authority from Scripture, I immediately retort upon you your own argument against the Bishop of London; you argue in a circle; you are 'thrown back and forward from one horn to the other;' you believe the Bible to be inspired because the Church has authority to declare it to be so; you believe the Church has that authority because you find it (or what you represent as it) in the Bible. But if, on the other hand, you declare that the Church has, independent of Scripture, an inherent authority, founded on tradition, or on something, by which it first declares itself infallible, and then declares the Bible inspired, I again retort upon you, and say, that if driven to an assertion, a mere *ipse dixit*, instead of proof, I shall prefer the authority of the Word of God for its own inspiration to that of the Church of Rome for its own infallibility. If the Church claims at all to be infallible, I should be more ready to give credence to that claim, if provable by Scripture, than to believe the inspiration of the latter on the bare authority of the former, that authority resting on its own assertion." The Cardinal must either stop the play of his readers' intellect at the particular point, and say—"Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further," or, having led the mind by a train of reasoning, such as it is, to that point, he must go a step further, and remove, from before his Church's claim, the very difficulty he has himself thrown as a stumbling-block before that of the Bible.

(To be continued).

FESTIVAL OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE RELICS OF SS. PATRICK, BRIGID, AND COLUMKILLE—JUNE 9.

In days of old, when Translations of the Bible were much less common, and less thought of, than they are now, the minds of religious people were often very much occupied

with Translations of bones and relics of the Saints, connected with which, from time to time, very wonderful circumstances were not unfrequently narrated. What is implied by a Translation, used in this latter sense, a good many of our readers are probably more or less aware. Those who are wholly unacquainted with the nature of the ceremony may now have an opportunity of learning somewhat of its character, from the account which is to follow; while all, we doubt not, who give this paper an attentive perusal, will feel not a little interested at the sufficiently curious particulars which we propose here to submit to their consideration.

There is published by Messrs. Richardson and Son, of Capel-street, in Dublin, for the edification of Roman Catholics in these countries, a very neat little book of the lives of SS. Patrick, Brigid, and Columkille: it is bound in green cloth, with gilt edges, has for frontispiece a handsome copperplate of St. Patrick *spificating** the serpents, and an ornamental title-page with rubricated letters, wherein the book is called "*a Triple Leaf, just collected from the purest sources*;" which prepares one for finding some rather poetical matter in the narratives to follow, and may suggest also, to a cautious reader, the propriety of examining the purity of the sources concerned; though the black letter inscription at the commencement "*For God, Our Lady, and St. Patrick*," might, perhaps, appear to some a sufficient guarantee, that, under such auspices, nothing but what was very carefully ascertained to be truthful and orthodox would be presented for perusal in the volume.

From this little book, as appearing to be the latest and most respectable thing of the kind provided for popular use, we take the following account of the Translation of the relics of the patron Saints of Ireland, occupying the last three pages of the work—(pp. 146-148):—

"During the incursion of the pirate Danes in the ninth century, the holy remains of St. Bridget were, for security, transferred from Kildare to Down, and deposited with those of St. Patrick; and soon after St. Columba's sacred relics were removed from Hy, and laid in the same resting-place. The memory of this event was indeed long and faithfully preserved, but gradually the remembrance of the precise spot in which the holy remains lay became obliterated both from the minds of clergy and people, perhaps because that, originally, the knowledge of the circumstance was, for greater security, confined to a few. The extraordinary veneration entertained for this *saintly trio* by the glorious St. Malachy, who, in the year 1136, occupied the primatial see of Armagh, made him desirous to discover their hallowed tomb; and as every means devised by his ingenuity for procuring such information had proved unavailing, and that human exertion had failed, he had recourse to omnipotent prayer, and, with a holy importunity, besought our Lord to reveal to him what he was so anxious to know. He was heard: for lo! after having persevered for some time in urging this pious request, on a certain night, while still communing upon it with God in the Church, a ray of light resembling a sunbeam was seen by him to pass along the sacred edifice until it reached a particular spot, when it ceased to advance. Convinced that the Divine Majesty had appointed this means of enlightening him on what he was so much interested in, the holy-primate had the place dug up, and when the earth was removed, behold! the bodies of the three blessed saints were discovered in the same grave. When exhumed, Malachy had them deposited in new coffins, and once more enclosed in their sepulchre.

"On learning the circumstance from the holy prelate, De Courcy, Lord of Down, concurred with him in sending deputies to the holy see to solicit permission from the pope to deposit the sacred relics more honourably, and to remove them to another part of the church. Urban III. then filled St. Peter's chair, and, having personal knowledge both of St. Malachy and De Courcy, he instantly ordered Vivian, Cardinal Priest of St. Stephen, to proceed to Ireland to assist at the celebration of the intended ceremony. He did so; and, on the appointed day, the 9th of June, feast of St. Columba, the translation† took place with the usual solemnities: the venerable remains being interred in the place prepared, in presence of fifteen bishops, and a numerous assemblage of priests.

"To preserve the memory of this consoling event, it was immediately decreed that the anniversary of 'the translation' should be thenceforward kept as a solemn festival throughout Ireland, which decree has long since, for just reasons we presume, ceased to be in force."

'Twere a pity, surely, that there should be any just reasons for risking the memory of so consoling an event. That there do exist sufficiently weighty considerations, which might exercise an influence in that way is, however, only too certain, as we shall easily make apparent.

It is very odd that the author of the "*Triple Leaf from the purest sources*" has not communicated to his reader the year in which the above marvellous transaction is supposed to have taken place, as he might have found it, as well as the rest of the story, in any of the authorities which contain the same recital. According to *Giraldus Cambrensis*, in his *Topographia Hibernie*, Dist. iii., c. 18, the

* We hope our English readers will not deem an expressive *Irishism* inadmissible on such an occasion—we maintain the word, if not altogether classical, ought to be made so forthwith.—Ed.

† N.B.—The few italics used in this extract are from the original.

* See the *Hornet* Panline.

* See *Catholic Layman*, vol. i., page 113.